

JAN 31 1918  
UNIV. OF MICH.  
LIBRARY

# The Classical Weekly

VOL. XI.

MONDAY, JANUARY 28, 1918

No. 14

## Just Published

### Cornell Studies in Classical Philology

VOLUME XX

## GAIUS VERRES

An Historical Study

by FRANK HEWITT COWLES

Price One Fifty

Other Volumes of the series are:

- I. The CUM Constructions: their history and functions, by William Gardner Hale. Part i: Critical, 1887. Part ii: Constructive, 1889. (Out of Print.)
- II. Analogy and the Scope of its Application in Language, by Benjamin Ide Wheeler, 1887. (Out of Print.) (Price 80 cts.)
- III. The Cult of Asklepios, by Alice Walton, 1894. (Price 80 cts.)
- IV. The Development of the Athenian Constitution, by George Willis Botsford, 1893. (Price \$1.50.)
- V. Index Antiphonteus: composuit Frank Lovis van Cleef, 1895. (Price \$1.00.)
- VI. Studies in Latin Moods and Tenses, by Herbert Charles Elmer, 1898. (Price \$1.50.)
- VII. The Athenian Secretaries, by William Scott Ferguson, 1898. (Price 50 cts.)
- VIII. The Five Post-Kleisthenean Tribes, by Fred Orlando Bates, 1898. (Price 50 cts.)
- IX. Critique of some Recent Subjunctive Theories, by Charles Edwin Bennett, 1898. (Price 50 cts.)
- X. The Athenian Archons of the Third and Second Centuries Before Christ, by William Scott Ferguson, 1899. (Price 75 cts.)
- XI. Index in Xenophontis Memorabilia, Confecerunt Catherina Maria Gloth, Maria Francisco Kellogg, 1900. (Price \$1.00.)
- XII. A Study of the Greek Paean, with Appendixes containing the Hymns found at Delphi and the other extant Fragments of Paeans, by Arthur Fairbanks, 1900. (Price \$1.00.)
- XIII. The Subjunctive Substantive Clauses in Plautus, not including Indirect Questions, by Charles L. Durham, 1901. (Price 80 cts.)
- XIV. A Study in Case-Rivalry, being an Investigation Regarding the Use of the Genitive and Accusative in Latin with Verbs of Remembering and Forgetting, by Clinton L. Babcock, 1901. (Price 60 cts.)
- XV. The Case-Construction after the Comparative in Latin, by K. P. R. Neville, 1901. (Price 60 cts.)
- XVI. The Epigraphical Evidence for the Reigns of Vespasian and Titus, by Homer Curtis Newton, 1901. (Price 80 cts.)
- XVII. Erichthonius and the three Daughters of Cecrops, by Benjamin Powell, 1906. (Price 60 cts.)
- XVIII. Index to the Fragments of the Greek Elegiac and Iambic Poets, as Contained in the Hiller-Crusius Edition of Bergk's Anthologia Lyrica, by Mary Corwin Lane, 1908. (Price 80 cts.)
- XIX. The Poetic Plural of Greek Tragedy, in the Light of Homeric Usage, by Horace Leonard Jones, 1910. (Price 80 cts.)

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO.,  
443 Fourth Ave., New York

## How do your pupils translate?

Do they get the meaning from the words in their Latin order as did the Romans? Probably not, yet this is the only way in which they can come to a real appreciation of the spirit of the original.

### PORTA LATINA

By FRANK GARDNER MOORE, *Columbia University*

is designed especially to train the pupil in right habits of translation. It is for use during the second year and contains Latin passages for translation, punctuated in an ingenious manner to suggest the *viva vox*. It teaches pupils to recognize phrases instead of words as the units of thought and to take them in the order of the original.



xviii + 62 + lxii pages. 60 cents

**GINN AND COMPANY**

70 FIFTH AVENUE

NEW YORK

## FOR THE TEACHING OF CICERO

### Bishop, King, and Helm's Cicero (Morris and Morgan's Latin Series)

Edited by J. REMSEN BISHOP, Ph.D., Principal, Eastern High School, Detroit; FREDERICK ALWIN KING, Ph.D., Instructor in Latin and Greek, Hughes High School, Cincinnati; and NATHAN WILBUR HELM, A.M., Principal, Evanston (Ill.) Academy of Northwestern University. Cloth, 12mo, with introduction, notes, and vocabulary.

**T**HIS edition is issued in two forms: one containing the six orations most frequently required by Colleges for entrance—the *Manilian Law*, the four orations against *Catiline*, and *Archias*; the other giving, in addition, the *Milo*, *Marcellus*, *Ligarius*, and *Murena*, and selections from the Letters. The *Murena* is included because it exhibits Cicero's powers to a generous degree, and with the *Milo* affords material for rapid reading.

Such help as seemed to be required by the ordinary student is freely given. Grammatical principles are enunciated as far as possible, and references to the leading Latin grammars are given.

### Harness, Kirtland, and Williams's Cicero

Edited by ALBERT HARKNESS, Ph.D., LL.D., late Professor of Latin, Brown University, assisted by J. C. KIRTLAND, Professor in Phillips Exeter Academy, and G. A. WILLIAMS, Ph.D., Professor in Kalamazoo College. Cloth, 12mo, with notes, vocabulary, and illustrations.

**F**OR convenience this edition of Cicero has been published in two forms. The larger volume includes the four orations against *Catiline*, the oration for the *Manilian Law*, for the poet *Archias*, for *Marcellus* and for *Ligarius*, and the *Fourteenth Philippic*. The smaller volume contains the first six of these orations.

The notes are in keeping with modern methods of teaching, and have been prepared with a view to meeting the needs of both student and teacher. The vocabulary contains the primary meanings of words and such special meanings as occur in the orations. Particular attention is paid to etymology and to the significant elements of compound and derivative words.

**AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY**

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

# THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. XI

NEW YORK, JANUARY 28, 1918

No. 14

## PHENOMENA OF THE HEAVEN IN THE ODYSSEY

Miss Jane Harrison, in *The Year's Work in Classical Studies*, for 1915, page 76, enthusiastically endorses a statement of Professor Grace Harriet Macurdy, of Vassar College, in *The Classical Quarterly* 8.213, that the

Odyssey differs from the Iliad not only in knowing Zeus less in his aspect of sky—that is aether—God, but in its lack of sensibility to all the phenomena of the heaven. 'Fire and hail, snow and vapours, wind and storm fulfilling his word'.

But there is no lack of sensibility to all the phenomena of the heaven in the Odyssey. That poem in fact abounds in perception of such phenomena. It mentions cloud or mist, wind, lightning, thunder, (or 'thunderer' sometimes), rain, snow, storm, frost, the Dawn, Sun, Moon, the stars, the firmament in its external sense (apart from specific mention of the stars) not less, I count, than 287 times<sup>1</sup>. Surely no lack of sensibility to the heaven!

The following figures are substantially accurate as to the number of times allusions to these various phenomena occur in the Odyssey. Cloud or mist, wind, lightning (both from clouds and from clear sky), thunder (or 'thunderer' sometimes), rain, tempest and clear sky are directly associated with Zeus about 56 times. The number of allusions is as follows: Zeus in relation to cloud or mist 16, wind 8, lightning 9, thunder (or 'thunderer' sometimes) 18, rain 3, tempest 1, and clear sky 1. Directly associated with Poseidon we have cloud once, the wind twice and the storm once. The wind is directly associated with Athene at least four times, with 'some angry god' once (19.201), with 'the gods' once (4.520), with Circe twice, with Calypso once, and with Aeolus more than once. Atlas upholds the pillars separating earth and sky.

Again, cloud or mist, wind or storm (sometimes 'the spirits of the storm'), frost, dew, rain and snow, not associated with any god, are mentioned not less than 76 times. The Dawn<sup>2</sup> (Eos, as goddess of the morn) is spoken of about 51 times, and each time is invested with ethereal beauty. What more gorgeous trait of heavenly phenomena than Homer's 'golden-throned', 'rosy-fingered', 'fair-tressed' dawn!

<sup>1</sup>This total, however, includes some repetition.

<sup>2</sup>I exclude several references to the dawn, and a few allusions to the 'dawning'.

The Sun, including Helios Hyperion as a luminary only, appears about 50 times, the Moon about 8 times, the stars or starry sky about 11 times. The firmament (I include in the term, for instance, 'wide-heaven', 'sky', 'heaven', etc., all in an external sense and exclusive of specific references to the stars and to 'the starry sky') is mentioned about 20 times. Not included in any of the foregoing references is the fact that the Odyssey repeatedly names Zeus as the author of the days, the nights, and the seasons. Furthermore, the poem repeatedly alludes to 'the immortal night', 'the divine night', 'the sacred day'.

Homer's Zeus in the Odyssey stirs us, as only Homer can, with the dazzling flashes of the lightning, the peal upon peal of the thunder, the awful majesty of the storm.

The real prominence of sensibility to all the phenomena of the heaven in the Odyssey will be better appreciated if that poem is compared with the works of Sophocles. The Odyssey comprises 12,120 lines, the extant works of Sophocles about 10,341 lines (this, however, is not the exact relation between the two in the extent of matter, owing to the difference in spacing between epic and dramatic poetry). As we have noted, the total number of references in the former to the phenomena stated is at least 287, whereas the total number of such references in Sophocles does not exceed about 100! But Sophocles cannot be justly considered to be lacking in sensibility to the phenomena of the heaven; far from it.

Professor Macurdy correctly observes that there are more allusions to such phenomena in the Iliad than in the Odyssey, but she fails to appreciate that this difference, rightly viewed, implies no plurality of authors. It simply signifies a difference in theme and scope between the two poems.

Professor John A. Scott, with his characteristic penetration, in *The Classical Journal* 12.145-146, in reference to Professor Macurdy's statement unanswerably points out that the greater extent of open air life in the Iliad rendered observations of the heavens more natural and more frequent than in the Odyssey. Furthermore, I think, the Iliad was composed when the immortal poet's fire of imagination was all aglow, while the charm of the Odyssey was produced in the evening of his life.

The marvelous consistency in these numerous allusions to heavenly phenomena which characterizes



both the Homeric poems is but one of the many links in the invulnerable chain of proof of the artistic unity of each poem. This is true not only in the relation of each poem to itself but in its relation to the other. This artistic unity is the certain stamp of a single, supreme, genius.

Critical legerdemain with reference to Homer has had its day. Future scholarship in general will be astonished (as much of present scholarship already is) at the influence F. A. Wolf had on the learned world for rather more than a century.

What has become of the doctrines of the Peisistratean theory, Athenian Interpolations, Solar Myths, Expurgations, Traditions (to name but a few)? They have returned to the aether whence they came; see some comparatively recent and unanswerable criticisms along these lines, such as those of John A. Scott in *Classical Philology* 6.419 ff. and 9.395 ff., and in *The Classical Journal* 12.119 ff.; that of Andrew Lang in Appendix B to his book *The World of Homer*; also Dr. Leaf's *Homer and History*, 310, though of course Dr. Leaf is a Separatist (no sentiment not directly quoted or cited should be imputed to any modern authority referred to in this article).

That celebrated Homerist, Friedrich Blass, declares (*Die Interpolationen in der Odyssee*, 12, published in 1904) that the difficulty of conceiving a single Homer author of both poems decreases as our knowledge of antiquity increases. And much progress has been made since even Blass's time. The brilliant J. W. Mackail of Oxford (an Homeric Unitarian) says (*Lectures on Greek Poetry*, 3, published 1911):

During the last generation our knowledge of the ancient world, our methods of investigation, our armament of criticism, have all undergone immense expansion.

As is well known, the stream of reaction against Separatist Criticism flows broad and strong; recall Professor Shewan's highly impressive presentation of authorities in his article, *Recent Homeric Literature*, in *Classical Philology* 7.190 ff.

Why do not the Separatists refute Andrew Lang and Karl Rothe after a lapse of about ten years? Simply because those epoch-making authorities regarding Homer are irrefutable.

There will be generally restored that Homer whose personality was not doubted by the world's two greatest original thinkers, Plato and Aristotle. Their acceptance of that personality—thousands of years nearer the Homeric Age than our time—is a fact of immense import and one to which due weight has not been accorded by modern critics.

One of the three or four foremost of modern intellects, far ahead of his time, answered the Wolfian school nearly a hundred years ago; Goethe, whose genius penetrated the grey mists of Ages, in his final words regarding Homer observed:

Behind these poems there stands a splendid unity—a single, lofty, creative mind.

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON.

C. A. MAURY.

## BRUTUS AND THE SHIPS OF THE VENETI

In *De Bello Gallico* 3 Caesar describes the ships of the Veneti and the battle between 220 of these ships and the Roman fleet commanded by Decimus Brutus. The contest presented peculiar difficulties, for the enemy's ships were built of oak in such solid fashion that the beaks of the Roman galleys made but slight impression upon them<sup>1</sup>. Moreover, they stood so much higher out of water than the Roman ships that their sterns overtopped even the towers erected on the decks of their opponents<sup>2</sup>. But as in the famous action between Gaius Duilius and the Carthaginians, Roman resourcefulness triumphed over adverse conditions. Since the enemy depended wholly upon their sailing powers<sup>3</sup>, the Romans made the sails the special object of their attack, cutting the ropes which held them up, and so bringing down sails and yards together.

There seems to be no doubt as to the result of the Romans' device, but exactly how it was accomplished is not perfectly clear from Caesar's language. He describes the manoeuvre as follows (3.14.5-7):

Una erat magno usui res praeparata a nostris, falces praeacutae insertae adfixaeque longiuris, non absimili forma muralium falcium. His cum funes qui antemnas ad malos destinabant comprehensi adductique erant, navigio remis incitato praerumpébantur <prorumpébantur, β>. Quibus abscisis <praeacisis, β> antemnae necessario concidebant; ut, cum omnis Gallicis navibus spes in velis armamentisque consisteret, his ereptis omnis usus navium uno tempore eriperetur.

It is clear enough from this description that certain ropes were cut and that when they were severed the sails fell to the deck. It seems altogether probable that the ropes in question were the halyards. That is the view of Dr. T. Rice Holmes, who in Caesar's *Conquest of Gaul*<sup>4</sup>, 91, renders the passage as follows:

Then with sharp hooks fixed to the ends of long poles, the Romans caught hold of the halyards and pulled them taut; the rowers plied their oars with might and main; and the sudden strain snapped the ropes. Down fell the yards.

With this rendering I should agree, except that I believe that the ropes were cut rather than snapped by the sudden strain. This is indicated by Caesar's words, *quibus abscisis* (3.14.7), as well as by the sharpness of the *falces*, whether *praeacutae* be taken to mean 'very sharp' or 'with sharp edges'<sup>5</sup>. On pages 236-237 Dr. Holmes discusses the question in some detail. He makes it perfectly evident that it would have been impossible for the Romans to cut the 'ropes which bound the yards to the masts' if these were the

<sup>1</sup>Neque his nostrae rostro nocere poterant (tanta in his erat firmitudo), neque propter altitudinem facile telum adigebatur, et eadem de causa minus commode copulis continebantur (3.13.8).

<sup>2</sup>Turribus autem excitatis, tamen has altitudines puppium ex barbaris navibus superabant, ut neque ex inferiore loco satis commode tela adigi possent et missa ab Gallis gravius acciderent (3.14.4).

<sup>3</sup>cum omnis Gallicis navibus spes in velis armamentisque consisteret (3.14.7).

<sup>4</sup>See *The Classical Journal* 6.133 ff. That the second meaning is possible, although in my opinion not probable, is shown by such uses as Vergil, *Ecl. 7.12* praetextit arundine ripas Mincius; Aeneid 6.5 litora curvae praetextunt puppes.

*ceruchi*, but that they might have reached the halyards of the Gallic ships, if these were made fast to the gunwale, or near it, as was in all probability the case. In his edition of *The Gallic War* he gives further arguments in favor of the same opinion, which, considering the height of the enemy's ships, seems to me undoubtedly correct. Since only the yards fell, and not the masts, the ropes which were cut were not stays. They must have been either *ceruchi* or halyards, and under the circumstances could only have been the latter.

Nevertheless it is quite impossible for me to believe that one who knew anything at all about ships and their rigging, or even one who saw a ship for the first time, could by any possibility describe the halyards as *funes qui antemnas ad malos destinabant*. The purpose of the halyards is so obviously that of hoisting the sails, that even a man wholly unacquainted with the sea and with ships would hardly think of calling them 'the ropes which bound the yards to the masts'. I certainly cannot believe that Caesar, who, though perhaps not much of a sailor, had certainly travelled a good deal by sea, would have been guilty of such an inaccuracy.

How, then, is Caesar's account of the battle to be reconciled with the facts of the case? I think this may be done, if we bear in mind that Caesar did not take part in the contest, but witnessed it from the cliffs near by. His account was therefore based upon what he saw from a distance and somewhat imperfectly and on what he afterwards learned from Brutus. Caesar saw the sails of the enemy's ships fall, and either saw or learned from Brutus the contrivance with which the result was accomplished, but he was probably not near enough to see exactly what ropes were cut. He therefore drew his own conclusions at the time and probably never thought of making further inquiries. The result was obvious and important; the exact manner in which it was accomplished was unimportant.

Now, if Brutus brought down the sails and yards of the ships of the Veneti by cutting the halyards, those ships must have been rigged like a modern cat-boat, except that the mast was probably not so far forward, while the sail was approximately square. Or, in other words, they were like the primitive Homeric ship on a large scale, the sail of which together with the yard was hoisted and lowered by the halyards. Such an arrangement is also made probable by the fact that their sails were of skins or of leather<sup>2</sup>, for such sails would have been more readily handled in that way.

But in their size and weight the ships of the Veneti resembled the Roman *naves onerariae*, and these were rigged in quite a different fashion. The yard, although it might in some cases be lowered, was not ordinarily let down when the sails were furled, but the sails were brailed up upon it, as in the well known

Ostia relief. Sometimes this was done from the deck by means of brail-ropes; at other times the sailors went aloft for the purpose, as we know both from the literature and the monuments<sup>3</sup>.

In the ships of war, on the contrary, the mast could be lowered and often was lowered. The process of raising the mast is described in some detail by Lucan, 2.695 ff. Apparently the yard was first attached to the mast with the sail brailed up upon the yard. Then in this case, after the mast was raised, the sails were let down from the yard by the sailors, who went aloft for the purpose, not apparently because it could not have been done from the deck, but to avoid the noise made by the ropes and pulleys, since they were trying to escape the notice of the enemy. Conversely the yards were sent down before the mast was lowered: see *Bellum Alexandrinum* 45.3; Lucan, 3.45; Livy, 36.44.2; Cicero, *Verr.* 2.5.88.

Thus, when Caesar saw ropes being cut which brought down yards and sails together, he naturally thought of the *ceruchi* and described them accurately enough as *funes qui antemnas ad malos destinabant*, without particularly considering the difficulty of reaching ropes at the yards of ships of such great size. We may bear in mind in this connection the criticism which Asinius Pollio passed upon the *Commentaries*, according to Suetonius (*Julius* 56.4):

Pollio Asinius parum diligenter parumque integra veritate compositos putat, cum Caesar pleraque et quae per alios erant gesta temere crediderit, et quae per se vel consulto vel etiam memoria lapsus perperam ediderit, existimatque rescripturum et correcturum fuisse.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

JOHN C. ROLFE.

## REVIEWS

*The Dramas and Dramatic Dances of Non-European Races in Special Reference to the Origin of Greek Tragedy, with an Appendix on the Origin of Greek Comedy.* By William Ridgeway. Cambridge: at the University Press (1915). Pp. xv + 448. 92 Illustrations.

In 1910 Professor Ridgeway published a book entitled *The Origin of Tragedy with Special Reference to the Greek Tragedians*. In this he accepted Aristotle's statement that Greek tragedy originated with "the leaders of the dithyramb", but maintained that "certainly in Pindar's own time, and probably from its first rude beginnings, the dithyramb was used in commemoration of heroes" (page 6), never having been confined solely to the ritual of Dionysus. He rejected, moreover, the canonical doctrine that satyric drama formed the intermediate stage in the develop-

<sup>2</sup>In the *naves onerariae*, in which oars were not used, except sometimes for special purposes such as turning the ship, the yard seems to have remained up permanently, the sails being brailed up upon it from the deck by means of brail-ropes, or by sailors who went aloft: compare Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 3.614 f. and the relief from Pompeii in Daremberg and Saglio, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités*, 1.705 f., 851, and Hill, *Illustrations to School Classics*, 399.

<sup>3</sup>*pelles pro velis alutaeque tenuiter confectae* (3.13.6).

ment of tragedy from the dithyramb, and argued that tragedy and the satyr-play were independent. In his opinion, only the latter was Dionysiac in origin, being derived from licentious rites of fertilization such as still survive in the North Greece carnivals, while tragedy developed from "propitiatory rites performed at the tombs of heroes" like Adrastus of Sicyon (compare Herodotus 5.67). Evidently anticipating that not many classical scholars would be ready to abandon the Dionysiac origin of tragedy, Mr. Ridgeway tried to forestall this eventuality by saying (93)

that, as Dionysus himself had almost certainly once been only a Thracian hero, even if it were true that Tragedy had risen from his cult, its real ultimate origin would still be in the worship of the dead.

This argument reappears on pages 5 f. of the present work; and it is interesting to note, in passing, that in order to establish the status of Dionysus as a hero Mr. Ridgeway has to resort to so late an authority as Plutarch. Under less favorable circumstances he is not unaware what criticism to pass upon such a procedure (see below). Inasmuch as so unreliable an argument could afford but scant security to Mr. Ridgeway's drifting craft, he dropped a final anchor to windward in Chapter III. This was entitled *Primitive Dramas amongst Asiatic Peoples*, and sought to establish a certain plausibility for ancestor worship as the origin of Greek tragedy by attempting to prove that Asiatic drama likewise sprang from the same source.

The present volume is an amplification of this chapter in the earlier work and ought frankly to be recognized as a last desperate effort to keep a floundering hypothesis afloat. The first of its eleven sections serves as an Introduction and is devoted to refuting recent theories as to the origin of Greek drama, especially those propounded by Miss Jane Harrison, Professor Gilbert Murray, Mr. F. M. Cornford, and others belonging to what Mr. Pickard-Cambridge has dubbed "the confraternity of the Eniautos-Daimon". In the main, these writers have turned their attention to dramatic origins only since the appearance of Mr. Ridgeway's earlier work, and their refutation was apparently another animating motive for expanding it. The author's wit and penchant for debate make this section piquant reading. Especially amusing is the following *reductio ad absurdum* (60 f.):

But a moment's reflection will convince the reader that the features which Professor Murray takes as characteristic of this ancient ritual drama of the death and rebirth of the Year can be found not only at any moment in human life, but in the whole realm of nature. For example, on a garden lawn is a happy family, two old sparrows feeding their young; enter the lady's favourite cat; she pounces on a baby sparrow (*Peripeteia*), a short struggle (*Agon*), speedy death (*Pathos*), and the cat retires rending her victim (*Sparagmos*). All under the eyes of little Tommy, who (*Messenger*) runs in to tell his mother what the naughty cat has

done; meantime the parent sparrows are expressing their grief (*Threnos*) in unmistakable terms; the lady comes forth and discovers (*Anagnorisis*) the cat (*Theophany*) returning (possibly with an eye to another of the brood), her former victim lodged comfortably within, the two now in process of forming one body, if not one personality.

Sections II to X take up in geographical order the "dramas and dramatic dances" of nine regions ranging from the Near East to Japan. The uniform object is to prove that Hassan and Hussein (the grandsons of Muhammad), Adonis, Attis, Antinous, Osiris, Rama, the thirty-seven Nats of Burma, and countless others whose sorrows or achievements have been commemorated or venerated throughout these countries were not Vegetation spirits but historical characters, and that "dramatic" ceremonies in honor of their shades were the immediate source of the native drama in each case. So far as the argument is here directed against the Vegetationists, the reviewer has little to say; the sight of one anthropologist attempting to expose the fallacies and extravagances of the others is not likely to cause a mere classicist much regret. But, when Mr. Ridgeway endeavors to frame a constructive hypothesis, all who have regard for the nature of evidence must suffer pangs of logical indigestion. To begin with, the arguments are built after the expedient Herculean principle; if one link in the chain of evidence is present, the whole case is at once acclaimed as if proved beyond dispute. It is but of a piece with this to say that, except where they are needed to demolish his opponents, Mr. Ridgeway seems constitutionally incapable of drawing distinctions. Thus, on page 154 he is quick to differentiate between "ritual dialogue" and "dramatic ritual", because it militates against his adversaries to do so. But the differences between mourning for the departed, respecting their memories, commemorating their exploits by quasi-pageants, coercing their powers by sympathetic magic, and genuine ancestor worship apparently lie beyond his ken. Still worse is the loose way in which the word "dramatic" is employed. The ceremonies are rare indeed, especially if they can in any way be brought into connection with ancestor worship, which Mr. Ridgeway does not deem worthy of being characterized by this epithet.

Section XI is devoted to more primitive races of the present day. Mr. Ridgeway concludes (375) that the initiatory ceremonies of the Australian bushmen, the natives of Polynesia, the African aborigines, the Indians of North and South America, etc., upon which the partisans of the Eniautos-Daimon have laid such stress

have no prior or separate existence, but are mere later parasitic growths upon the primary and primitive belief in the existence of departed spirits, in whose honor the dramatic rites in every case are held.

This conclusion exemplifies the fundamental tenet of the present volume: in our author's opinion, "Vege-



tation, Corn, and Tree spirits, as well as those of rocks, mountains, and rivers, and what are collectively termed Totemistic beliefs", fertility-rites, initiation rites, mana, "the worship of Demeter and almost<sup>1</sup> all other Greek deities" are "not primary phenomena but merely secondary and dependent on the primary belief in the immortality and durability of the soul" (63, 337, and *passim*). It would follow that "tragedy and serious drama" (being everywhere associated with some form of religion) not only in Greece but "wherever they are found under the sun have their roots in the world-wide belief in the continued existence of the soul after the death of the body" (385). It would hardly lie within the scope of the interests to which THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is devoted to follow the ramifications of these theories. Every one understands that ancestor worship has played a prominent rôle in the development of religion; but the view that it is the parent of all, or practically all, other forms few will be disposed to accept.

Space may properly be used, however, to express an opinion upon the fundamental problem which lies underneath our author's two volumes, namely, the origin of tragedy in Greece, even though this matter figures only incidentally in the book under review. Prior to Arion and Epigenes there was nothing which the most fanciful could recognize as akin to modern tragedy. After the work of Thespis and Aeschylus no one can fail to note its presence. To trace, so far as we may, the gradual unfolding of the new genre from a state of non-existence to a period of vigorous growth seems to me a concrete problem and distinctly worth while. Now the songs and dances from which tragedy and the satyr-play developed were associated, *at the period when they became truly dramatic*, with the worship of Dionysus, and *at that same period* Dionysus was as truly a 'god' (as distinct from a 'hero') as any that the Greeks ever knew. To abandon these plain facts and others like them in favor of vague theorizing on religious origins will never bring us satisfactory results.

This is equivalent to saying that from a practical standpoint a study of the origin of religion is not indispensable for a discussion of the origin of Greek tragedy. To Mr. Ridgeway such a statement will appear heretical, but let us see how much better he fares. What was the point in his conceding that satyric drama was Dionysiac in origin, if it was to be argued that Dionysus himself had been a hero? In that case, the ultimate origins of tragedy and satyric drama must, after all, have been identical, and the differences in their origins must have consisted only of the minor divergences in the final stage of their development. In practice, how does this result differ from the more usual procedure, which ignores the ultimate sources and concentrates attention upon the final stage of develop-

ment? So far as I can see, it would differ only to the extent that the underlying religion of both genres would now be understood to be ancestor worship. But this distinction loses all practical meaning in view of Mr. Ridgeway's present contention that ancestor worship is prior to and the ultimate source of other forms of religion. What can be predicated of everything loses all value for purposes of differentiation. In other words, in spite of any resemblance which may have obtained between the ultimate forms of Dionysiac worship and the true veneration of heroes, *at the time when tragedy actually came into being* the existing differences between them were of much greater significance than any alleged identity of origin in the far-distant past could have been. If it were possible for Professor Ridgeway to substantiate his first position, that tragedy arose *directly* from the worship of the hero Adrastus at Sicyon or the like, there would be some meaning in his work. But his doctrine of ultimate derivation loses itself in primeval darkness.

As was to be expected, Mr. Ridgeway has changed his opinions upon not a few points. Thus, in his *Origin of Tragedy* (61), in his eagerness to prove that dramatic impersonation antedated Thespis, he declared:

But it is very likely that long before this time sacred dramas with impersonations of the gods were regularly performed in temple precincts, as for instance the Mystery Plays at Eleusis, as part of the regular ritual of the deity.

In the present volume, however, the exigencies of his argument force him into a saner position (24):

"The evidence of the writer", says Miss Harrison, "is indefeasible as regards the rites themselves". But whilst it is "indefeasible" for the rites as practised in his day, it by no means follows that it is of any value for the rites of Eleusis as practised in the sixth century before Christ, as assumed by Miss Harrison, Sir James Frazer, and the rest. It might as well be postulated that the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, which was only formulated in the latter half of the nineteenth century, was one of the doctrines of the early church. To put it briefly, the whole theory of the sacred marriage between the Sky-god and the Earth-goddess at Eleusis depends entirely upon writers who all lived after the Christian era and who described with accuracy the performances at Eleusis in their own time.

The Appendix on the Origin of Greek Comedy is, in the main, directed against the same group of investigators as was the body of the book. Mr. Ridgeway protests against the assumption that the phallic rites from which Aristotle declared comedy to have sprung were part of a "religious" ritual and against the further assumption of certain scholars that "all obscenity is religious". Be it observed, however, that Mr. Ridgeway himself felt no scruples in recognizing "a distinct survival of Dionysiac rites" in the obscenities of the modern North Greece carnivals (*Origin of Tragedy*, 15 ff.). The whole constructive side of the argument here is vitiated by the same ignorance of the inscriptional results obtained by Professor Capps and Dr.

<sup>1</sup>Why "almost" is inserted here does not appear. Many Greek divinities are mentioned on Mr. Ridgeway's pages, but none is recognized as "totally independent" of the cult of the dead.

Wilhelm as I was obliged to call attention to in one of his earlier papers (*Classical Philology* 8.264, n. 2). He is still under the impression (410) that "the custom of furnishing comic choruses must be assigned to a period posterior to 460 B. C."

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY.

ROY C. FLICKINGER.

Ingram Bywater. *The Memoir of an Oxford Scholar, 1840-1914.* By William Walrond Jackson. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press (1917). Pp. xi + 212. \$3.

Judged by comparison with the length of the now usual biography, autobiography, or letters, this Memoir will indeed seem brief. The author points out that materials for a life of Bywater are scant as compared with those for a life of Jowett. Unlike our own Benjamin Franklin, Professor Bywater was accustomed to destroy his letters and papers, and besides he left no diary.

It is a pleasant picture that we get of Bywater's father, a man of very moderate means, who spared no expense for his son's education. It was from his father that Bywater got his first instruction in Greek, Latin, and French. His serious study of Greek began when he entered Kings College School. From early years the boy evidently had a bookish turn; when, at the age of eighteen, he went up to Queen's College, Oxford, where he had obtained a scholarship, he carried with him about two hundred books. Here he came under the instruction of Lewis Campbell, and, to quote his own words, of "the distinguished man now known as Lord Bryce"; at the same time he had private tuition from Robinson Ellis, later Professor of Latin. He was intimate with Walter Pater, but could never accede to Pater's extravagant doctrine that aesthetic enjoyment was the chief end of man. Bywater took a first class in 1862; in the following year he was elected, along with his future biographer, to a fellowship at Exeter College. Soon afterwards he became very intimate with Mark Pattison, who more than anyone else influenced his future career. Pattison, a man of broad interests and of fine scholarship, soon led Bywater to choose the life of a scholar. Bywater at once set about making himself master of the scholar's technique and he made a thorough study of German methods. A remarkable instance, however, of his independence of judgment was shown at the time of the war of 1870. Oxford was largely pro-German, but Bywater, taking issue with his friend Pattison, warmly espoused the French cause.

Having once made his decision he never faltered in his devotion to the austere and heroic side of scholarship. He was averse to the popularization of knowledge and accordingly was strongly inclined to distrust men like Conington and Jowett. His wide knowledge of books, largely due, no doubt, to the stimulating intercourse with Pattison, led to his being appointed Sub-Librarian of the Bodleian, in 1879. His chances

were very good for becoming at an early date Bodley's librarian. However, fearing encroachment upon his time for study, he resigned the position, but was at once made a Delegate of the Clarendon Press, a place which he filled until his death. His bent in scholarship was made clear by the publication in 1877 of his now well-known *Heracliti Ephesii Reliquiae*. In the following year he issued privately a collection of Greek aphorisms, under the title *Gnomologium Baroccianum*. In 1886 appeared his edition of Priscianus Lydus, which he had been asked to prepare for the *Supplementum Aristotelicum* of the Berlin Academy. In 1890 appeared his text of Aristotle's *Ethics*. Finally comes his edition of the *Poetics*, which at once forces comparison with Butcher's famous work, which boldly bears the title *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*. "You must not expect from me", insists Bywater, "anything about fine art, for I don't think that Aristotle said anything about it". His Aristotelian studies were intimately connected with the Aristotelian Society, of which an entertaining account is given by his biographer.

Bywater had been appointed Reader in Greek in 1883. At the death of Jowett he was appointed, on the nomination of Gladstone, Regius Professor of Greek in 1893. This position he resigned in 1908. He was strongly opposed to compulsory Greek and his reasons are given at length in this Memoir. American scholars will read with pleasure of his friendly intercourse with Whitney, Goodwin, and Professor Gildersleeve.

The book is beautifully printed on excellent paper and contains, as frontispiece, a striking likeness of Bywater. But with all its excellences the price, three dollars, is outrageously high.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI.

G. C. SCOGGIN.

*The Argonautica of Gaius Valerius Flaccus Setinus Balbus, Book I, Translated into English Prose, with Introduction and Notes.* By H. G. Blomfield. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell (1916). Pp. 147. 3 sh. 6 d., net.

The author of this book is described on its title-page as Late Scholar of Exeter College, Oxford, and has after his name the initials M.A., I.C.S. The book begins with some 36 alleged verses, in English, labelled *Candido Lectori*, giving the story of the Argo. The lines, which are wholly gratuitous, abound in slang and shocking evidences of bad taste. In the Preface (7-12) the author tells us that this is the first translation into prose, in any language, of Valerius Flaccus. Indeed, only the first book has been translated into verse. The latter rendering, by Thomas Noble, published in 1808, Mr. Blomfield praises very highly (11-12). Mr. Blomfield tells us also, in the Preface, that he hopes, in time, to bring out a complete edition of Valerius Flaccus, with introduction, revised text, commentary, and appendices, maps, plans, illustrations, bibliography, and index. The present volume



contains notes, beneath the translation; the notes deal mainly with the mythological allusions in the text. The author tells us, finally, that his aim has been to render faithfully the sense of the original, and at the same time to produce a fairly readable version (9).

The Introduction (13-17) gives a short account of Valerius Flaccus. The author argues that the Setinus Balbus is no part of Valerius's name; why, then, are these words so conspicuously given on the title-page of the book? Mr. Blomfield regards as exploded the view that the poet of the *Argonautica* is the Flaccus to whom Martial addressed several epigrams. On pages 15-17 he writes most enthusiastically of Valerius Flaccus, as a real poet, who had something to say:

at his best he is perhaps not greatly inferior even to Vergil himself. Here, we feel, is a poet indeed and not a poetaster, and one who has not only a genuine insight and imagination, but also a very considerable gift of expression, and one, moreover, who is not always straining after effect. . . . the poet contrives to invest the loves of Jason and Medea with a human interest which is almost modern in tone and setting, and is all the more refreshing because it is conspicuously absent in both Apollonius and Vergil. Indeed Valerius treats the love-interest with a freshness and charm which are all his own. And in certain descriptive passages, which are fairly numerous, he reaches a beauty of word-painting to which we have to turn to Vergil himself to find a parallel; and Noble does not scruple to put Valerius even *above* the Mantuan.

This eulogy of Valerius had been juster had it been a bit more restrained. Mr. Dimsdale, in his *History of Latin Literature*, 446-453 (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 10.118-119), praises Valerius for his powers of description, and for his portrayal of Medea's love, but he is less the partisan and more the sound scholar than Mr. Blomfield. In concluding this part of his book, the author quotes, for the second time (see, for the first, page 7), Quintilian 10.1.90 *Multum in Valerio Flacco nuper amissimus*.

The prose-rendering reads well. How difficult it is to achieve this result in the case of the poets of the Silver Age every one who has read those poets knows. Frequently there are in the Notes quotations from Noble's verse-rendering of this book; often, also, Mr. Blomfield gives alternative renderings of his own, in verse. The notes are really voluminous, taking up 118 of the 145 pages devoted to translation and notes together! On these notes there is another series of notes, printed in still smaller type, explaining matters contained in the main commentary. There is in these notes too much of an effort to be smart and up-to-date in language. Thus, on page 34, Persius is described as the "Grahame-White of classical mythology"; on page 43, the wine-bowl that Theseus flung in the face of the centaur is described as "ancient equivalent of the modern whisky decanter". A very good feature of the book is to be seen in the numerous

references to books and articles that deal, directly or indirectly, with Valerius. The commentary, spite of its discursiveness, and its lapses from good taste, is welcome, especially since it is the only commentary in English on the poem.

Of the merits and demerits of the translation itself a fair notion can be got from the following extracts (see, in the Latin, verses 22-63, 788-817 [Aeson's curse of Pelias]):

Pelias had governed Thessaly from his earliest youth with a rod of iron, and was now well-stricken in years, and had long been feared by his subjects. His were all the streams that flowed into the Ionian Sea; wealthy he was, and his servants ploughed the slopes of Othrys and Haemus and the fertile plains below Olympus. But his mind had no rest through fear of his brother's son, and the boding oracles of the gods; for the prophets prophesied that he would destroy the king, and victims on the altars gave the same dread warnings. Above all the mighty renown of the warrior himself weighs on his mind, and his valour, a thing no tyrant loves. Wherefore he strives to anticipate his fears by killing the young man, even the son of Aeson, and seeks means and an opportunity to slay him. But he can find no wars, no monsters to be slain throughout the land of Greece: ere this Alcides had covered his temples with the gaping jaws of the lion of Cleone; long since had the men of Arcady been ridded of the Water-snake of Lerna; long since had the horns of both bulls been broken. So he be-thinks him of the angry sea, and remembers the perils of the vasty deep. With peaceful look, no frown upon his brow, he approaches the youth, and by his serious air adds weight to words that come from feigned lips: 'Grant me this service, more noble than the deeds of olden time, and give thyself up to it, heart and soul. Thou hast heard how Phrixus, sprung from the blood of our kinsman Crethus, escaped the altar whereon his father was about to sacrifice him. But alas! cruel Aeetes, who dwells in Scythia by frozen Phasis, shaming his mighty sire the Sun-god, slaughtered him whilst the hospitable wine-bowl circulated, amid the inviolable rites of the banquet, while the guests looked on in horror—unmindful of me and of the gods. Nor is it only rumour that tells the news. I myself, what time late sleep binds my tired limbs, have seen the youth in his own person groaning bitterly; his mangled shade dispels my slumbers with its incessant complaints, and Helle, now a deity of the mighty deep, gives me no rest. Had I the strength I once possessed, e'en now shouldst thou behold the punishment of Colchis, and see the head and arms of its king brought back in triumph. Alas! long since, with advancing years, has the keen edge of my youthful ardour been blunted; nor is mine own son yet ripe for empire or war or exploits o'er the seas. But thou, glorious youth, in whom already there is a strong ambition and a manly spirit, go and restore to the walls of a Grecian temple the fleece of the ram sent down by Nephele, and deem thyself worthy of such a perilous task'. In this strain he encourages the young man, and then holds his peace, as one who commands rather than exhorts; saying naught of the Black Rocks that clash on the Scythian main, naught of the grim Dragon that guards the fleece; whom, as it darted forth its forked tongues, the king's daughter was wont to entice from its secret abode by spells and offered food, and to give it honey already livid with the poison of the day before.

C. K.

## ON READING LATIN ALOUD\*

I have read with much satisfaction the advice of C. K. (*THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 10.81-82, 89-90, 97-98) to read Latin aloud, which I can support from my own experience.

I urge all with the greatest emphasis to follow C. K.'s advice. Nearly all the time spent in translating into English is thrown away; because, if the reader has a proper command of English, and if he understands what he reads, he can translate nearly all of it without difficulty when put to it. The really difficult bits, which tax the translator, are few. Do not suppose this is a counsel of perfection. Our staple work in this School is reading aloud, nothing else: every book is read aloud from beginning to end, and the result is that large masses are retained in the memory without further effort. We only make sure that it is *understood*, and difficulties are explained in Latin (or Greek) until they are understood. And, though it may seem strange, when we do want to translate, we can do it very easily. We compete with all other Schools, where all the time is spent in translation, we compete, I say, in the very difficult scholarship examinations, and hold our own easily; although these consist chiefly of translation—I could indeed say more with truth, but I content myself with that. And the enjoyment is multiplied a hundredfold; real, genuine, unforced enjoyment, which can only come when the matter is understood at once, such enjoyment as we have rarely felt with Horace and Vergil, because our enjoyment came *after* long hours of wrestling and drudgery spent on these very texts. The boy trained in reading gets his drudgery done upon very different material; he comes fresh to Vergil and Horace, and makes their acquaintance in the most favorable circumstances. And there is no mistake possible when a boy does enjoy something; he lets you know it.

PERSE SCHOOL HOUSE,  
Cambridge, England.

W. H. D. ROUSE.

## DEUS PRAESIDIUM NOSTRUM†

Praesens maioribus deus,  
iam posterisque spes,  
nos ventis, undis perditos  
in portum tuto ages.

Potenti regno sub tuo  
metu omni liberi,  
tibi solum confidimus,  
re nulla terri.

Ante ipsam terram conditam,  
ante ardua montium,  
e sempiterno tempore  
aeternum te deum!

\*Part of a letter sent by Dr. Rouse last spring. The rest of the letter, which enters into highly controversial matters, may, perhaps, be presented at a later time, when there is space for controversy, and I have leisure to discuss Dr. Rouse's views in detail.—C. K.

†These Latin stanzas a version of Isaac Watts's familiar hymn, O God, our help in ages past, Our hope for years to come, are offered as an addition to the material available for singing.

Vicissitudo temporum  
saeculorum saecula  
aetati non ferunt tuae  
moram nec taedia.

Mortales aufert tempus heu,  
ut flumen, irritos,  
aut somniis aut mobili  
aurae simillimos.

Ut antea, patrum deus,  
sic semper nos colas;  
emensos aequor te duce  
in portum tuto agas!

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

H. C. NUTTING.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN STUDIES  
HUMANISTIC SERIES

Mention should have been made before this of important additions to the University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series. In 1915 Professor Louis Charles Karpinski, of the Department of Mathematics of the University of Michigan, brought out an edition of Robert of Chester's Latin Translation of the Algebra of Al-Khowarismi; this contained the Latin text, an English translation of that text, an Introduction, and Critical Notes. The original work is one of importance in the history of mathematics, as may be seen from an examination of reviews of Professor Karpinski's edition, the one, by Professor David Eugene Smith, the distinguished mathematician, of Teachers College, published in *Science* 43.389-391 (March 17, 1916), the other, by Professor Milton W. Humphreys, distinguished at once as Greek scholar and as mathematician, in *The American Journal of Philology* 37.354-357.

In 1916 Dr. John Garrett Winter, of the University of Michigan, produced an English version, accompanied by an Introduction and Explanatory notes, of *The Prodrum* of Nicolaus Steno's Dissertation Concerning a Solid Body Enclosed by Process of Nature within a Solid Body. This has been reviewed by Professor Humphreys, in *The American Journal of Philology*, 38.201-203.

These two books form parts of Volume XI of the University of Michigan Studies.

In 1917 Professor Henry A. Sanders, of the University of Michigan, produced further fruits of his study of the Freer Biblical Manuscripts in a volume entitled *The Old Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection, Part II, The Washington Manuscript of the Psalms*. This forms part of Volume VIII of the University of Michigan Studies. For Professor Sanders's earlier studies of these manuscripts, as well as for the importance of the manuscripts themselves, see a review in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 6.213-214, by Professor B. W. Bacon, of Yale University.

The decipherment of the manuscript of the Psalms was a work of enormous difficulty, requiring endless patience and skill. In the Introduction to the present volume Professor Sanders discusses I. The Manuscript (107-109); II. Palaeography (110-124); III. The Text Problem (125-132). C. K.